

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 were pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 2, 8, 10, 12, 15 to 18, and 20, and canceled claims 1 and 11.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 15, 17, and 19 for lack of antecedent basis for certain claim elements. Applicant has amended claims 15 and 17 to provide the appropriate antecedent basis for the claim elements. Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the objections to claims 15, 17, and 19.

§102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,540,414 ("Brezina et al."). Applicant has canceled claims 1 and 11, thereby rendering their rejections moot.

§103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 2 to 4, 12 to 14, and 16 to 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezina et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,265 ("Svarfvar et al."). The Examiner rejected claims 5 to 9, 15, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezina et al. in view of Svarfvar et al. further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,856 ("Chiu et al."). The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezina et al. in view of Svarfvar et al. further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0152701 ("Liu et al.").

Applicant has amended claim 2, which now recites:

2. A fiber optic module, comprising
an electromagnetic interference (EMI) shield, comprising:
a conductive mesh defining (1) small openings that shield EMI and (2) at least one large opening that allows a fiber optic connector to pass through the conductive mesh; and
conductive contact fingers;
a first housing insert molded with the EMI shield.

Amended claim 2 (emphasis added).

None of the cited references, whether alone or in combination, discloses “a conductive mesh defining (1) small openings that shield EMI and (2) at least one large opening that allows a fiber optic connector to pass through the conductive mesh” as recited in amended claim 2 (emphasis added). The Examiner may wish to combine the optical coupler of Brezina et al. with the conductive meshes of Svarfvar et al. to make obvious amended claim 2. While the conductive meshes of Svarfvar et al. define openings, none of the conductive meshes define both “small openings ... and at least one large opening” as recited in amended claim 2. Specifically, Figs. 1 and 2 illustrate a mesh 10 that defines openings 11 but not both “(1) small openings ... and (2) at least one large opening” as recited in amended claim 2. Figs. 4 and 5 illustrate a mesh 20 that defines openings 21 but not both “(1) small openings ... and (2) at least one large opening” as recited in amended claim 2. Figs. 6 and 7 illustrate a mesh 30 that defines openings 31 but not both “(1) small openings ... and (2) at least one large opening” as recited in amended claim 2.

The Examiner may wish to modify the conductive meshes of Svarfvar et al. with a “large opening” as recited in amended claim 2. However, such a modification would impermissibly render the conductive meshes of Svarfvar et al. unsatisfactory for their intended purpose. See MPEP § 2143.01. As Svarfvar et al. shows in Fig. 9, a conductive mesh 42 is inserted molded into a cavity 44 of a housing shell 40 to provide EMI shielding. If a larger opening is formed in conductive mesh 42, then the EMI would escape through the larger opening to the environment and render conductive mesh 42 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Accordingly, amended claim 2 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 3 to 10 depend from amended claim 2 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.


Applicant has amended claim 12 to recite similar limitations as amended claim 2. Accordingly, amended claim 12 is patentable over the cited references either alone or in combination for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2.

Claims 13 to 20 depend from amended claim 12 and are patentable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 12.

Summary

In summary, claims 1 to 20 were pending in the above-identified application. Applicant has amended claims 2, 8, 10, 12, 15 to 18, and 20, and canceled claims 1 and 11. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the claim rejections and allow

claims 2 to 10 and 12 to 20. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480x206.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
 Signature	<u>12/8/05</u> Date

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Hsia
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,235